DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 789 CS 500 709

AUTHOR Lieb-Brilhart, Barbara; And Others
TITLE Implications of University Reorganization of Speech Departments for the Preparation of Secondary Communication Teachers; Group 3 Report of the Education Priorities Division of the Speech Communication Association.
INSTITUTION Speech Communication Association, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 73
NOTE 47p.; Paper presented at the Annual Summer Conference of the Speech Communication Association (9th, Chicago, Illinois, July 12-14, 1973); Also in "Proceedings" published by Speech Communication Association, edited by R. Jeffrey and W. Work, pp. 15-21, pp. 85-120

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Communication (Thought Transfer); *Conference Reports; Curriculum Design; *Educational Development; Models; Secondary School Teachers; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

Given the realities of new developments in the field of communication, particularly as these have been reflected in administrative reorganizations at the university level, group participants sought to identify the implications of these changes for secondary teacher preparation. In order to establish the data from which to delineate the issues for deliberation, six position papers were delivered and discussed. The first two presented views on the implications of university reorganization for the preparation of communication teachers for the secondary schools. The next two papers described current teacher preparation models and possible new models for communication education. The last two papers provided input for consideration of the practical problems in transition from old to new teacher preparation models. Some of the recommendations resulting from deliberation included careful specification of the competencies in communication that teachers seek to develop in children, increase in the quantity and quality of communications addressed to teachers, improved training of teachers, and the organization of university instructors politically to effect changes in local school settings, State departments of public instruction, and national agencies and organizations. (WR)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 091789

GROUP THREE - IMPLICATIONS OF UNIVERSITY REORGANIZATION OF SPEECH DEPARTMENTS FOR THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY COMMUNICATION TEACHERS

Barbara Lieb-Brilhart, Chairperson

Educational priorities emerging from the Airlie Conference recommended the development of curricula emphasizing interpersonal and functional communication in K-12 speech programs. Such priorities have apparently emerged from the recent emphasis upon interdisciplinary research and teaching of communication in its many dimensions beyond that of the traditionally emphasized persuasive public speaking. The interdisciplinary or non-disciplinary view is reflected in new texts such as that by Budd and Ruben[1] in which speech is represented as but one among many approaches to the study of communication. Indeed, the trend in universities has been toward the development of new administrative structures such as schools, departments, and centers of communication where scholars, regardless of discipline, could study from various viewpoints the problems, processes, and products of communicative acts.

Furthermore, the growth of numerous professional organizations (of which SCA is but one) seeking public and professional support for their interests in the study of communication further reflect multi-disciplinary claims to the area.

Given the realities of new developments in the field of communication, particularly as these have been reflected in administrative reorganizations at the university level, group participants sought to identify the implications of these changes for secondary teacher preparation.

Input Phase

In order to establish the data from which to delineate the issues for deliberation, six position papers, representing diverse viewpoints, were delivered and discussed. The first two, by Richard B. Lee and Robert Hopper, presented views on the implications of university reorganization for communication teacher preparation in the secondary schools. The next two papers, by William Davidson and Sharon Ratliffe, described current teacher preparation models and possibilities of new models for communication education. A summary of the specific data related to state certification standards was distributed as an addendum to Mr. Davidson's paper. The last two position papers provided input for consideration of the practical problems in transition from old to new teacher preparation models as experienced by Charles Carlson in the state of Ohio and by Dean Frost in a local school setting. These position papers are presented in Appendix C.

Deliberations and Recommendations

From the discussion of the position papers presented during the Input Phase, three probelms were delineated by the group participants for more intensive deliberation in subgroups:

---

[1]R. W. Budd and B. D. Ruben (eds.), Approaches to Human Communication (New York: Spartan Books, 1972).

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Speech Communication Association
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

CS 500 709

1. In what ways should secondary and college departments be organized administratively to reflect new interdisciplinary approaches to communication?

2. What certification models should be recommended for teachers pre-K through community college to reflect new communication interdisciplinary approaches?

3. What recommendations should be implemented by SCA to improve existing secondary speech programs?

Interest Group One - Administrative Reorganization
Robert Hopper, Group Leader

The deliberations of the interest group concerned with administrative reorganization of departments centered on the following issues:

1. Similarities and differences among members of the speech profession and those of other professions interested in communication.

2. The position to be adopted by SCA in its advocacy of administrative structures maximally reflective and pragmatically supportive of the changing field of communication.

3. The relevance of administrative reorganization to teacher training programs.

After the discussion of the foregoing issues during the afternoon meeting, the interest group adopted the following recommendations which were later endorsed by participants in the full group.

1. SCA, through its publications, committees, and other mechanisms, should continue the thrust begun at the Airlie Conference for unification of many scholarly organizations relating to communication. (comm-unity).

2. Based on the belief that communication programs should promote an interdisciplinary focus, endorsement was given to the following set of guidelines as a position on administrative organization to be recommended by SCA:

   a. Disciplinary boundaries should be viewed as places for interaction and interface rather than as areas for conflict.

   b. In post-secondary educational institutions, speech communication related units should lead attempts to form administrative structures focusing on study and instruction in functional communication behaviors.

      (1). In universities, such units should become colleges or schools of communication in order to enjoy the advantages of increased political support and visibility which such structures make possible. Furthermore, in forming such structures, consideration should be given to advantages of influence upon existing

situational variables such as other interdisciplinary programs, clusters and residential colleges, problem-centered disciplines, continuing education and extension programs, and the "classroom without walls" concept.

(2). While the departments, subject areas, or subdivisions which collect themselves into schools of communication are likely to vary among institutions, such subject areas which are likely to contribute effectively to a school of communication are: Intrapersonal, Interpersonal, and Organizational Communication; Speech and Hearing Services (including a component on communication development); Intra- and Intercultural Communication; Broadcasting; Cinematic Arts; Interpretation and Theatre; and Journalism (including electronic journalism).

(3). Communication majors should be encouraged to pursue studies beyond that offered in the school of communication, for example, in English, Linguistics, Anthropology, Psychology, Sociology, Education, and Business.

(4). New Administrative Structures should be implemented on a five-year-rolling-planning basis with constant updating and long-range concern.

3. Since trends such as that in Michigan foreshadow the emergence of interdisciplinary secondary programs, SCA's Associate Executive Secretary for Education should encourage secondary speech teachers to lead in the formation of administrative structures reflecting more global, interdisciplinary communication programs. Such programs would include subject areas outlined for university schools of communication and, in addition, might incorporate composition and literature.

4. With reference to teacher preparation, SCA should support the position that:

   a. Each secondary teacher prepared by a school or college of communication should, in addition to a broad communication background, choose and develop a specialized field of expertise such as one of those mentioned in Recommendation 2 b.

   b. Through the specification and dissemination of qualifications SCA should promote a vision of the "Communication Teacher" as a certified, qualified instructor focusing upon practical instruction in functional communication behaviors.

   c. All teachers (K-12) should receive practical communication instruction in schools of communication primarily through courses from the interdisciplinary curriculum which might also include the course in "Communication for Teachers."

Interest Group Two - Certification Models
Sharon Ratliffe, Group Leader

The group deliberating on recommendations for certification models (K-Community College) which would reflect new communication interdisciplinary approaches centered discussion on the following issues:

1. Establishment and monitoring of standards of effective communication programs.

2. Establishment and monitoring of preparation and certification criteria for communication teachers.

The recommendations emerging from the discussion of these issues, subsequently endorsed by group participants, were:

1. A four-fold approach should be taken to solve problems of appropriate teacher preparation models.

   a. The SCA Educational Policies Board should establish a committee whose task is to identify characteristics essential to teacher preparation models for communication teachers. Application should then be solicited from university departments of speech communication which incorporate those characteristics in their teacher preparation models. A reasonable number of these college and university programs should then be named as experimental communication teacher training centers sanctioned by SCA. Funding should be sought and educators and researchers at these centers should begin (1) to identify the roles and test the competencies deemed important in teaching communication in the secondary school, (2) to employ and evaluate a variety of secondary school teacher-college and university faculty-lay personnel-high school student-teacher trainee relationships, (3) to explore possible political-legal arrangements between SCA, colleges and universities, secondary schools, and state boards and departments of education for certifying secondary school communication teachers.

   b. SCA snould actively pursue interdisciplinary coordination with professional associations in the language arts for the purpose of identifying a core requirement recommended as common for teacher preparation models for all subject areas within the communication rubric.

   c. EPB should identify basic (core) competencies for the beginning communication teacher with the encouragement that they achieve additional competencies in the more specialized areas of the communication discipline as they fulfil permanent certification.

   d. Airlie Recommendation E-3 regarding minimum certification standards for teachers should be focused on competency-based standards not only for secondary school communication teachers

but also for the college faculty who prepare secondary school communication teachers.

2. With respect to the maintenance of the quality of communication programs, the following three-fold approach is recommended:

   a. SCA should develop standards for effective communication programs at elementary, middle, senior high school, undergraduate, and graduate levels.

   b. The EPB should take responsibility for restructuring the criteria for evaluating what is now labeled "speech" in the Evaluative Criteria publication (1974 copy deadline for 1980 publication).

1 c. SCA should develop and make available a list of evaluators in all states who may be called upon (in teams) to evaluate secondary school speech communication programs.

3. The Airlie Recommendation E-7 regarding the facilitation of exchanges of resident professors should explicitly be expanded to include the exploration of exchanges between K-12 teachers and university faculty responsible for training K-12 teachers.

Implicit in the discussion of teacher preparation models was the belief that individuals who did not demonstrate specified competencies should not be "sanctioned" by the communication profession as teachers. Accordingly, those not considered "appropriate" as defined by early experiences in the teacher preparation program would be phased out and not permitted to continue.

Interest Group Three - Improvement of Existing Secondary School Programs
William Davidson, Group Leader

The group deliberating upon recommendations to be implemented by SCA for the improvement of existing secondary speech programs discussed the following issues:

1. Insufficient articulation between secondary and college faculties
2. Lack of attractive graduate programs for secondary teachers
3. Insufficient contact between SCA and individual states on issues related to concerns of departments of public instruction
4. Difficulties for secondary teachers in keeping abreast of developments emerging from the field of speech communication
5. Lack of relationship between contest related activities and communication instructional objectives in the secondary schools
6. Lack of publications and other media that speak directly to the secondary teacher.

Recommendations emerging from the discussion of these issues follow:

1. To improve relationships between secondary and college faculties, SCA should:

   a. Encourage post-secondary faculties to interact with secondary teachers to a) hear their assessment of needs, and b) respond with instruction and programming in those areas.

   b. Promote teacher exchange programs with colleges and universities on national and international levels.

   c. Continue to promote summer institutes, but include high school students and the exchange of secondary and college staffs.

   d. Establish one liaison in each state who will organize a task force to report to SCA in one year on the number of secondary teachers in their state speech associations and steps that have been taken to encourage secondary school participation. In addition, the liaison would contact state and regional associations to involve more secondary teachers in programs and publications.

2. SCA should seek to promote the development of graduate programs attractive to secondary teachers. Such programs should present an integrated study of communicative acts (specifying commonalities in such areas as written communication, interpersonal communication, and mass communication.).

3. EPB should fund travel for individuals to offer short courses in speech communication at area meetings of secondary teachers and administrators not affiliated with the speech communication profession.

4. SCA should formulate and disseminate a statement describing the relationship between contest related activities and sound objectives of instruction in communication in the secondary school.

5. To provide materials designed for the secondary teacher, SCA should:

   a. Start a new SCA publication with a "how to" focus such as "throw away sheets" or workshop monographs.

   b. Investigate the possibility of new media to reach teachers.

   c. Encourage the increase (to a majority) of the numbers of secondary teachers on state journal editorial boards.

SUMMARY

It is difficult to express in print the essence of all that was said by the more than seventy participants in the Educational Priorities Division. Many good ideas undoubtedly escaped transition from the oral to the written mode. The haste with which recommendations were, of necessity, constructed may cloud the framer's true intent. In bold print, all thirty-five of the recommendations appear to have equal weight. In fact, they differ substantially in merit. Some recommendations are the

product of extensive and thoughtful interaction. Others were hurriedly composed in the closing minutes of a long and strenuous day.

Whatever the merits of the individual recommendations, some very significant things were said. The stimulus papers which comprise appendices A, B, and C suggest the full range of important topics which were considered. In the few paragraphs which follow an attempt will be made to capture the tone and temper of the interaction.

Many participants expressed discontent with the status of contemporary speech communication instruction in the schools. Secondary school curricula reflect too little of the understandings which have emerged from the study of communication at the university level. In the elementary school, the systematic study of communication is even more hazily represented. We apparently find ourselves caught in the "thorns of the trilemma": the heritage of the past which has identified us with activity-oriented speech pedagogy; the unhappy reality of the present, where even the content of the past has not been accepted as worthy of a requirement in every secondary school; and the call of the future where colleagues in a number of disciplines may come together to comprise a field called "communication."

Recognizing that we are not what we might be, conference deliberations focused on the means for improving communication instruction in the schools. We must, first of all, specify, in a very clear way, what we are about. A number of interest groups called for the careful specification of the competencies we seek to develop in children. Additionally, we must learn more about the measurement of such competencies and the instructional strategies which enable their acquisition. We must also ensure that our insights concerning communication education are disseminated to those who must know. A number of interest groups called for an increase in the quantity and quality of communications addressed to teachers: improved convention programming, more and better summer workshops, more and better in-service programs, new and improved journals, and the use of non-print media in communicating with teachers. Our training of teachers must also be improved. Most secondary teacher preparation programs for the subject labeled "speech" do not adequately prepare teachers to build secondary curricula focusing on the multi-faceted nature of human communication. Nor do most teacher preparation programs ensure that its graduates possess basic teaching competencies. As we discover what we must be and communicate our new insights to teachers in training and teachers in the field, we must also ensure that we organize ourselves politically to effect changes in local school settings, state departments of public instruction, and national agencies and organizations.

The deliberations of this division were infused with optimism toward the future and with our ability to upgrade our present programs, administrative structures, and teacher preparation models to meet the communication needs of tomorrow's students. Our charge to SCA is that it become the catalyst organization for promoting organizational and academic changes that efficiently promote the study and teaching of communication knowledge that is multi-purposed, multi-contextual, and multi-disciplined at all levels of academic curricula.

APPENDIX C

Commissioned Stimulus Statements

on

Implications of University Reorganization of Speech Departments for the Preparation of Secondary Communication Teachers

Education Priorities Division Group Three

Barbara Lieb-Brilhart, Chairperson

A DIFFUSION STRATEGY FOR SECONDARY SPEECH COMMUNICATION

Richard B. Lee
Florida State University

The concern of this paper is to estimate the impact of organizational changes in departments of speech communication upon the secondary teacher. First, it describes an idealized model of the relationship between two educational systems, higher education and the secondary school through the input of new teachers. It then describes facts and conditions which mitigate the influence of colleges and universities upon the conduct of speech communication in the secondary school. Finally, it proposes strategies to promote the flow of innovation into the secondary school through the medium of practicing, tenured teachers.

The proliferation of new courses and new departments in speech communication over the past ten years attests to the vigorous state of the profession. Under ideal conditions, this wealth of innovation could be transmitted to the secondary school if certain conditions could be met. The first requirement would be an elastic number of hours for the bachelor's degree, capable of expanding to accomodate the growing number of areas of interest. Ideally, the holder of the bachelor's degree would know rhetoric and public address, oral interpretation and drama, group discussion and dyadic communication, debate and intrapersonal communication, and both mass communication and speech pathology, not to mention the areas of interest that will rise to prominence in the future.

Next, ideal articulation between secondary and higher education would require a teacher job market with a large turn-over rate that could absorb its new teachers, who would then implement with minimum delay what they learned in course work leading to the bachelor's degree. It would also require that secondary speech communication be taught primarily by teachers trained in the subject, or alternatively, that teachers holding a teaching certificate in speech have a bachelor's degree in the subject. Under these conditions, the teaching of secondary speech would be sensitive to change in the profession at the university level.

Not one of these conditions can presently be met. The number of credit hours required for graduation has changed very little over the past fifty years. Through this aperture must pass the courses that constitute the new teacher-subject matter preparation. The reorganization of speech departments into separate departments of drama, speech pathology, and mass communication is relatively new, but competition of emerging areas of interest for a place in the curriculum is not. For example, during the first third of this century, speech pathology developed as an interest. As the number of pathology courses grew, university course offerings in rhetoric declined dramatically along with elocution and oratory.[1] The graduate of 1920 must have looked at the new graduate in speech of 1935 acutely aware of what the youngster didn't know about rhetorical analysis and delivery. In 1972, nearly 5,000 new teachers graduated with certificates in speech and drama. Over half of these graduates came from eight states all with large universities which contain separate departments for

drama, mass communication, and speech pathology.[2] Since the hour requirements for a major do not expand with the growing interests of a profession, the inevitable result is increasing specialization at the expense of a broad knowledge of all of the many interests contained in speech communication. The fact of departmental reorganization, with requirements for the major that exclude some of these fields of interest, simply makes specialization more visible.

The current effect of this specialization at the secondary level appears to be less now than at any time during the last 25 years since the input of new teachers is declining dramatically. Nation-wide, 1968 was the cross-over point for supply and demand in the teacher job market.[3] The national turnover rate for teachers has dropped to 6% and appears to be going lower as the median age of teachers gets younger. This is a reflection of the fact that the post-war baby boom has moved through high school, and the rate of expansion has flattened out. This and a nation-wide long-term job shortage has encouraged new teachers to keep jobs they get, and made them less inclined to move, quit teaching, or take leaves of absence to do graduate studies.

The declining hiring rate has been especially acute for new teachers certified in speech and drama. Of fourteen secondary specialties, only two, social studies and journalism, placed a smaller percentage of new teachers in 1971.[4] Thus there are two factors that minimize the effect of changing coursework requirements upon the conduct of speech communication instruction in the secondary school: an over-all decline in the hiring of all new secondary teachers, and a declining proportion of those hired among holders of certificates in speech and drama. Demographic projections over the next decade suggest little change in this situation.

Finally, it is not at all clear that speech communication majors actually teach most of the speech communication courses in the secondary school. First, in the most populous states, the English major can acquire a second certificate in speech and drama by showing a minor in speech, or less, a non-reciprocal arrangement that does not, apparently, let the speech communication major pick up an English certificate as easily. Not coincidentally, the hiring rate for new teachers with English certificates has run about 10 % higher than for similar teachers certified in speech and drama over the past 20 years, regardless of the condition of the job market.[5] It is reasonable to assume that many certificate holders have had six courses in speech communication or less. Cut-rate certification in speech further dilutes the impact of changes at the university level upon the conduct of this profession at the secondary level.

This influence is further attenuated by a widespread practice at the secondary level to define speech-communication courses along with reading, as belonging to the domain of English. This obviates even the need for a certificate in speech. For example, in the mid 60's Squires and Applebee surveyed high school English practices. They reported that 6% of class time was spent on public speaking and mass media.[6] A more recent survey of elective programs in English shows that speech, theatre arts, debate, oral interpretation, mass madia and film courses constitute over 15% of the course offerings.[7] The English curriculum is respon-

ding to administrative pressure for greater course flexibility, student pressure for more relevance and to dissatisfaction from English teachers themselves with what is now coming to be called elitist literature. In short, speech communication is becoming a major alternative for the secondary English curriculum. It is here that the opportunity lies for input by the university-level speech communication profession. The target audience is not the undergraduate major in speech, but the practicing, tenured teacher of secondary English.

Approaches to these teachers will probably be well received. In their survey, Squire and Applebee polled English teachers for interest in the college courses they had taken. Sixty-five percent expressed great or some interest in the speech and drama courses they had taken. By contrast, only 39% of these English teachers could muster the same level of enthusiasm for traditional grammar. Clearly their college experiences have created a receptive audience for contact by speech communication.

The next question deals with the most efficient channel of communication. Increasing reluctance to leave teaching temporarily to return to full time study suggests that the profession will have to go to the teachers, rather than the other way around. In fact, the SCA Conference on Long-Range Goals and Priorities (the Airlie Conference) recommended that "the SCA should make available . . . consulting task forces to institutions seeking to establish or upgrade programs in speech communication."[8] Rather than going to each institution, it would be more efficient to send a representative to the annual state convention of teachers of English. This is close to an ideal setting as can be found. These meetings are heavily attended by opinion leaders in the schools. University personnel outside of the campus classroom faculty who attend these state meetings know that teachers come with a real hunger for new and better teaching strategies. There is neither time nor much receptivity for long discussions of policy in this setting; what is wanted is concise instruction about how to instruct more efficiently. The six-hour mini-course, with precisely stated performance objectives for participating teachers and spread over a day and a half, would accomplish much in improving instruction in secondary speech communication subjects and far more than any change we could make in our on-campus training programs for new teachers. With advance notice, representatives from commercial publishing houses often go to great lengths to bring, display, and discuss related textbooks in the display area between class sessions. Ethics require, of course, that at least two or more representatives be invited. By late Saturday afternoon, the practicing teacher can leave the state convention with new or improved teaching skills and even a knowledge of what textbooks to select from.

The strategy outlined here is identical in spirit to two other kinds of in-service training already practiced by members of SCA. The four regional institutes initiated this year are longer and more intensive, but they attract from a constituency already oriented to speech communication. The proposal above seeks to bring speech communication professionals into brief and productive contact with a constituency that identifies primarily with English. Members of SCA have also approached teachers of English on their own ground; recently

Wallace Bacon and Robert Breen presented a program on oral interpretation to the annual convention of the National Council of Teachers of English. In terms of dissemination efficiency, the state-level meetings collectively attract far more teachers and offer fewer programs to compete for the attention of those attending. The outreach to English has already begun; the question now is how to expedite it.

Implementation of an outreach program could be accomplished in the following way. First, let self-selection operate to determine who wants the responsibility. A letter or telephone call to the NCTE offices in Champaign-Urbana will provide a schedule of state meetings within driving or short-hop flying distance. Let the Educational Policies Board receive proposals initiated by members of SCA to provide these mini-courses. The proposal should include the attendance figures for the last state convention, a vita, and a list of performance objectives for participants in the mini-course, to be reviewed on the basis of their clarity, in much the same way that a divisional program committee selects papers for presentation at annual convention. In the proposal should also be an evaluation instrument to be filled out by participants and returned to the EPB (Several versions have been developed for mini-courses in SCA conventions.). Finally, let the EPB and the Finance Board authorize payment for mileage and over-night accommodations, if necessary.

What lies behind this proposal is the principle of constructive cooperation between speech communication and English. It is a short-range plan to accomplish short-range objectives, the immediate improvement of the teaching of secondary speech communication. Clearly there is a need for an interface between the two professions. For example, only 1% of the members of the National Council of Teachers of English subscribe to The Speech Teacher. Communication among the practicing teachers of speech communication must be established before cooperation can begin.

Longer range objectives can be accomplished by constructive cooperation at the college and university level, both internally, within different departments of speech communication and externally, with departments of English. Cooperative graduate programs can be designed that will attract practicing teachers and return them to the public schools with both an advanced degree and the skills and knowledge that reflect the many skills of speech communication. Cooperative programs will require a genuine commitment to excellence for the secondary curriculum, for higher education has many countervailing precedents and forces, such as competition for graduate enrollments, the tendency toward strict specialization at the graduate level, a tradition of restricting practical courses to the undergraduate levle, and the territorial instinct. Let these cooperative degree programs reflect both the strengths of cooperating departments and perceived regional needs as expressed through secondary language-arts curriculum planners and teachers, for these, in the final analysis, are the change agents. They should be listened to attentively. An interface between secondary and higher education, coupled with an active commitment to constructive cooperation among departments in higher education will promote continuing articulation between the speech communication disciplines and practicing secondary teachers.

Changes in the preparation and certification of new teachers now is a long-range strategy whose impact will not be felt for a decade or more. The Airlie Conference has already issued a strong recommendation to the Educational Policies Board for national guidelines for secondary certification in speech communication. This is a first step. A second one is to eliminate, state by state, cut-rate certification in speech so that only majors in speech communication can earn the certificate. This is political action that demands patience and time -- time to appear before legislative sub-committees, committees and hearings conducted by state credentialing agencies. Much potential resistance can be eliminated by interdepartmental dialogue on campus, since other disciplines, notably English, have a vested interest in the status quo. A third step in assuming proper training for secondary teachers of speech communication can come about only by persistent persuasion. It was established earlier that much of innovation in speech communication has been absorved into the English curriculum by a fiat of definition. Respect for disciplinary domains will come about only after planned and organized interaction among university faculties and thier opposite numbers in the secondary school and face-to-face interaction in the proposed mini-courses with secondary teachers of English at state conferences. Thus the short - and intermediate-range proposals here directly contribute to long-range goals as well.

Central to these proposals are the reorganized, differentiated departments of speech communication. With their increased specialization, they are in a better position than ever to speak precisely to the felt academic needs of the secondary language-arts teacher, however labeled or certified. There is much talking to be done to identify the sub-specialties that are far enough developed beyond theory to be applicable in the secondary school. They also stand on a potential meeting ground for practicing teachers of English and English faculties in higher education. The initiative is in our hands.

* * * *

FOOTNOTES

1. From Thomas E. Coulton, "Trends in Speech Education in American Colleges," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, NYU, 1935, reported in Donald K. Smith, "Origin and Development of Departments of Speech," in Karl R. Wallace, ed., History of Speech Education in America, Appleton-Century Crofts (New York), 1954.
2. "Teacher Supply and Demand in Public Schools," Research Report 1972-R8, National Education Association(Washington, D.C.), 1972.
3. "Teacher Supply and Demand."
4. "Teacher Supply and Demand."
5. "Teacher Supply and Demand."
6. James R. Squire and Roger K. Applebee, High School English Instruction Today, Appleton-Century Crofts (New York, 1968.
7. George Hillocks, Jr., Alternatives in English: A Critical Appraisal of Elective Programs, National Council of Teachers of English(Urbana), 1972
8. SPECTRA, IX (April, 1973), p. 9.

THE COMMUNICATION PROFESSIONS, SCHOOLS OF COMMUNICATION AND TEACHER PREPARATION

Robert Hopper
University of Texas at Austin

At the University of Texas, I am involved in a moderately successful structural unit which calls itself a "School of Communication." In order to live up to the assigned title of this paper, I will focus upon the effects upon teacher preparation of life in a School of Communication. I must begin, however, by asking some questions which seem prerequisite to such consideration. These questions are:

1. What is the nature of the field of speech communication, anyhow?
2. What are our secondary school teachers doing?
3. What should they be doing if we had our way?

I submit that the major cause of many difficulties which we discuss here today is our lack of assurance about what we are or stand for as a discipline, whatever a discipline should be. I further hypothesize that a state of assurance about one's identity is probably like love, relaxation and euphoria in that it is not likely to be attained by seeking it directly. (Parenthetically, one effect of a School of Communication structure is greater recognition from students and the public, which leads at least to a perception that whatever we stand for is worthwhile.)

On a low level of theory, speech communication today is less often regarded as strictly the study and practice of public oratory and more widely regarded as a study of many forms of interpersonal and public interaction. This is a pretty fuzzy definition, and its fuzziness is reflected by visions of what a secondary teacher of speech communication does.

Let me engage in stereotypes. One stereotypical vision of the speech communication teacher is a person who is primarily interested in public address and performance. Such a teacher teaches classroom-stand-up-and-talk-five-minute-oratory, coaches the debate squad, directs the school play, and sets up extracurricular tournaments in everything from declamation to extemporaneous speaking.

At one time this may have been a relevant and productive focus. In many cases, it is no longer productive today. Particularly, the emphasis upon extracurricular activities is criticized in the proceedings of the Airlie Conference:

> The formal classroom speech communication curriculum should be the focal point of instruction in secondary schools. Forensics, debate, and theatre should be considered extra-curricular workshops and not ends in themselves. (Recommendation E-8, I-B)

But this vision of speech communication teaching is still very much with us. In fact, one problem we face as we try to bring change in our teacher preparation program is that the average secondary principal in Spring Branch, Texas (to coin another stereotype) still is looking for a speech communication teacher to fit this mold. Several times per year, I hear the complaining: "But you have to prepare them for jobs that are there!" Also, students from such programs are a fair

percentage of our majors, which makes change difficult.

The vision of secondary speech communication teacher which we are presently promoting at the University of Texas is sort of loosely defined as a language arts and interpersonal communication specialist. We are experiencing limited success in trying to sell this innovation around the state. The vagueness in our definition is probably a national phenomenon.

The Airlie Report states that the Education Policies Board should appoint a committee to develop an Interpersonal Communication Instruction package for speech communication teachers from K-12. (Recommendation E-1, I-A) And further that "SCA should develop an all-inclusive communication package, K-12." (Recommendation E-19, I-A)

These two statements serve as fair indicators of how little we know about the proper new role for speech communication teachers. We do seem to know that whatever we do, we want to be good at it: Airlie conferees voiced (E-3; I-A) a demand for minimum certification standards for speech communication secondary teachers, but gave no hint as to what the standards should consist of. (This is a fair place for two asides: First, when we do design certification standards, I hope they will represent what a candidate can do, not simply what courses he has enrolled in. Let us not replay problems of ASHA's certification system. Second, we give much thought to secondary certification, but little to a) elementary certification, b) preschool certification for communication development teachers, c) certifying of business communication majors for consulting work, d) other occupational categories we might wish to develop.)

One persistant suggestion is to make our speech communication classroom very much like what English Departments talk about under the all-inclusive term "language arts:" Recommendation E-15; II-B states "SCA should lobby for speech components within the English language arts curriculum requirement." This recommendation seems akin to buying a ticket on the Titanic because there is a big crowd at the ticket window. I am generally in favor of interdisciplinary cooperation, and agree that speech communication teachers have at least as much to say about the so-called "language arts" as English teachers do, but it is more productive for us to sell our wares independently than to beg for the thirty minutes between tree-diagramming and the reading of Julius Caesar. (Another aside: One by-product of this movement for recognition within language arts is that I talk to many speech communication teachers who fear that language arts are an English plot to re-ingest speech and do them out of a job.)

All of which brings us back to the question: What do we have to offer as a field anyhow? As one form of offering an answer to my "identity-crisis" questions, I turn, as I promised to do, to the administrative concept "School of Communication" as practiced in Austin. I recently discussed this concept with the Dean of our School, Wayne Danielson. He stated that Schools of Communication are "more a center of interest than a discipline." He was noting that there have been large enrollment increases in our school during past years which he attributed less to the academic work of the faculty than to student interest in the generalized, nonspecific concept of communication.

Which leads me to think: What's a discipline worth anyhow? What does it do? Most everyone whose judgment I respect thinks that most distinctions between disciplines are fairly inane. My friends in rhetorical studies have more in common academically with colleagues in history, government, English and philosophy than with many of their communication colleagues. My friends in communication behavior have more in common with psychology, sociology and business. I teach a course in human communication development which is quite similar to courses on our campus in anthropology, sociology, education, English, folklore, psychology, and linguistics. I sometimes think: Take the ten or so professionals who teach those courses and you'd have a fantastic department of communication development! But I find that an absurd notion. Why?

First, because departments and colleges are fundamentally political entities. Second, because behavioral science is still young enough to value diversity. Gerald Holton, describes a similar situation in early physical sciences:

> In the journals of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, we can find, side by side, what we would now consider very heterogenious material - descriptions of violent thunderstorms, statistics and speculations on the causes of death in a certain village...observations on the propagation of light, on the growth of types of reptiles, on the origin of the world. The heterogeneity speaks of a marvelous and colorful efflorescence of interests and of unconscious exuberance..."[1]

I take this to be the same kind of incongruent complementarity of interest which makes our school of communication strong and attracts new converts. That's why it does not much matter what departments comprise a school of communication. So far these results have accrued:

1. A school of communication brings increased visibility and recognition on a college campus, and across a geographical region, and as one outgrowth of such visibility, we are just about to move our school into an expensive new building. Our school also has strong alumni support in mass media circles. Another outgrowth more related to our considerations here is a new English-Communication major being offered to secondary teachers. Rather than our having to lobby to included in the "language arts," English and the Texas Education Agency asked us for input into such programs - a small but significant improvement. There will probably come a day when literature and grammar studies will seek a place in communication curricula.

2. There is a feeling among students and faculty that ours is a "professional" school - as opposed to a liberal-arts curriculum. Students perceive that they are preparing for careers in the media, teaching, and therapy. This illusion is probably as important as any professionalizing of the curriculum we could devise.

3. Since administrative divisions are largely political, I could be remiss in not pointing out the purely political advantages we enjoy in a school

of communication. Since our dean reports directly to central administration, we are more powerful than departments lost in large Arts and Science colleges. Further, the comparatively small faculty in our school allows direct close interaction with our dean, giving an individual faculty member and his ideas access to power centers. It has even been my luck to team-teach a course with the dean of our school. Finally, this kind of structure recognizes achievement while providing a comfortable climate conducive to innovation. This is very important when you are trying to sell school principals in Big Spring on your concept of a secondary speech communication teacher.

In conclusion, the evidence in the forgoing indicates to me that SCA should promote an "ecumenical" spirit of communication studies, including the concept of schools of communication. Under such circumstances, the following measures, which I advocate, become more likely:

1. A broad but conceptually-oriented and updated vision of our discipline as a "process discipline, unbound by specific methods or models, with consistent focus on applied, professional skills.

2. Persuasive campaigns to diffuse this vision through SCA official organs and through directed communication to all teachers and administrators working in related areas.

3. Persuasive campaigns to diffuse this vision to our teacher trainers, student teacher supervisors, and to professors in schools of education.

4. Simultaneous implementation of this vision in all our academic programs. Thus, newly-trained teachers will be sent to newly-defined jobs.

5. Establishment of meaningful certification standards for speech communication secondary teachers and for a host of other communication-related occupations.

6. Encouragement of SCA to unite with ICA and other communication organizations to add to the image of "comm/unity" - which will attract further attention, vision and respect.

FOOTNOTE

[1] Gerald Holton, "The Thematic Component in Scientific Thought," The Graduate Journal, vol. ix (1973) supplement, pp. 28-30.

DESCRIPTIONS OF CURRENT TEACHER PREPARATION MODELS AND POSSIBLE NEW MODELS FOR COMMUICATION EDUCATION

William C. Davidson
University of Wisconsin - Stevens Point

In the book of Genesis, we are told about a time when "the whole earth was one language, and one speech." The pride of such a people eventually found expression in their building the tower of Babel, in the belief that they might be able to reach heaven. For being so presumptuous, God confounded their language and "scattered them abroad," thereby affording more than a lesson in what happens to those who act with Godlike pretensions. According to Einar Haugen, basically the same story occurs in the literature of other cultures; its popularity is attributed to the fact that

> it answered the question thoughtful men and women must have asked everywhere: why is it that all men have languages, but all so different? In the multilingual Near East the natural answer was: the diversity was a curse laid upon men for their sinful pride.[1]

The story applied to thses deliberations inasmuch as the "field" surely succumbs to the "curse of diversity" -- at least in terms of how we cope with it. All too often our response perpetuates diversity while ignoring commonality. A recognition of this problem is acknowledged in the Airlie Conference statement concerning long range goals. After noting that the divisions within the association mirror academic departmental structure and that such fractionalizing of knowledge is "artifical," they concluded"

> Oen negative consequence of the failure to recognize the organic nature of human communication has been the proliferation of professional and scholarly organizations concerned with different segments of the study of human communication. As a consequence, teaching and research in human communication lack coordination, cohesion, and unity.[2]

A similar "lack of coordination, cohesion, and unity" is reflected in most of the state certification standards and in the undergraduate teacher preparation programs.

A survey of the current certification standards, for example, yields the following general situation: 1) eleven states subscribe to the guidelines set forth by NASDTEC in 1971;[3] 2) ten states, including the District of Columbia, incoporate speech within (or as an option to) the certification requirements for English;[4] 3) twenty-one states have their own requirements, usually including a mixture of speech and drama, with the credit requirements varying from 15 to 30, or more; 4) of the remaining nine states, two leave the question of standards up to the degree granting institution, two are in the process of revision, one did not reply, and three do not fit comfortably into any of the above generalizations: Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Washington.[5] In addition, the states of Ohio and North Carolina deserve special attention, because recent revisions distinguish their standards from the others, if only because of the language employed.

With the exception of those states specifically mentioned, this summary reveals a lack of "coordination." More importantly, the course work or areas identified reflect a lack of coherence, for they do not attempt to provide or assure the prospective teacher with an understanding of what is common to all the areas. Indeed, there is a basis within tradition which suggests that such distinctions ought to be made, so as to appreciate the separateness of each area. An examination of individual curricular programs provides a better basis for illustrating this point.

Although the offerings available in Wisconsin may not be representative, they certainly reflect some of the more typical means by which college programs have approached diversity within the field. Of the twenty-four colleges in Wisconsin which have a speech program approved by the Department of Public Instruction, the typical route is to present a smattering of course work in public speaking, rhetoric-public address-criticism, and drama.[6] In addition, some require course work in mass communication (often allowing electives in particular areas) and course work derived from an application of the literature of the social sciences to the study of communication. These two general approaches (or various combinations of them) constitute the "current trends" in communication education.

The central question which emerges from them concerns the direction they provide for the future. Any "new model," I submit, must come to grips with the commonalities of our diversity. For the most part, the current programs do not achieve such an integration. To do so we must first postulate those concepts common to any communicative act. At the same time we must develop a terminology to which there is sufficient agreement that we can advance those understandings which we deem important enought to be required in a certification program. That direction may sound ominous -- it is. However, it is my conviction that until we dedicate ourselves to that task, we will be perpetually confronted with the "curse of diversity" and we will ignore the full potential that this discipline could offer to public education.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Einer Haugen, "The Curse of Babel," Daedalus, Vol. 102(Summer, 1973), p. 47.

[2]"The SCA Conference on Long-Range Goals and Priorities, Spectra, IX (April, 1973), p.13.

[3]Standards for State Approval of Teacher Education (NASDTEC, 1971), p. 66.

[4]Ibid., p. 38.

[5]William C. Davidson, " A Summary of State Certification Standards in Speech, Communication, Speech Communication, and Speech and Drama," unpublished manuscript.

[6]William C. Davidson, "Curricular Offerings of Wisconsin Colleges with Certification Programs in Speech, Drama, English, and Journalism, 1973, unpublished manuscript.

A Summary of State Certification Standards in Speech, Communication, Speech Communication, and Speech and Drama

William C. Davidson
University of Wisconsin - Stevens Point

ALABAMA: an institution having membership in or approved by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education; a curriculum approved by the State Board; speech is an approved subject for major and minor certification; class B - 24 credit major, 1- credit minor; class A and AA amount to more credits and graduate work.

ALASKA: NASDTEC

ARIZONA: certification requires qualification for a major in a subject commonly taught in the public high schools of Arizona; a major equals 30 credits.

ARKANSAS: Speech, 24 credits, divided equally (6 credits in each) among: 1) development of competency and understanding in oral communication, rhetoric and public address, group processes and oral interpretation; 2) preparation in directing speech and drama programs which must include both theatre arts and forensics; 3) preparation in speech improvement which must include phonetics and speech pathology; 4) electives.

CALIFORNIA: institutions define the makeup of their own majors with approval being dependent upon the knowledge, understanding, and skills needed by the teacher to teach particular subjects in the public schools.

COLORADO: evidently certification in speech; no official guidelines. "We use whatever is available fron the SCA, NETA, NASDTEC, and the vast experience of the members of our Commission."

CONNECTICUT: secondary English includes speech and drama; no separate certification. Nothing in mass communication, other than journalism.

DELAWARE: NASDTEC

D.C.: no certification in communication arts, speech, or drama. They are included under the general certificate in English.

FLORIDA: Speech: 12 credits in English and 18 in speech including: fundamentals of speech, discussion or debate, dramatics or oral interpretation, and phonetics.

GEORGIA: 30 semester hours (45 quarter hours) selected from the following areas: General speech (fundamentals, public speaking, phonetics, parliamentary procedure, oral communication, speech correction); drama and theatre(play production, acting, technical production, history of the theatre, play directing); disucssion and debate; and oral interpretation

HAWAII: guidelines under investigation and development; speech is a certifiable subject, requiring 30 semester hours, 6 of which may be in English.

IDAHO: Speech and Drama: 6 credits in each; or, 15 separately.

ILLINOIS: Speech and Theatre Arts: 24 hours in speech and 12 hours in theatre arts, or 24 in theatre arts and 12 in speech (the additional 12 equals concentration). Concentration in speech must include: 18 hours in the theory and performance of public address and communications, 1 course in oral interpretation, 1 course in radio, television, or film, 1 course in teaching methods.

INDIANA: Speech; 24 credit minor; 40 credit major; course work is specified and includes work in public speaking, discussion, debate, dramatics and oral interpretation, radio and/or television, speech science and correction, electives from one of the three "areas," and electives in English or Advanced Social Studies.

IOWA: NASDTEC., 1971.

KANSAS: English: 36 credits; journalism: 12; speech and theatre arts: 15 (in such course as: public speaking, theatre, discussion and debate, oral interpretation, and voice and diction). Journalism includes: basic journalism, photography, survey of mass communication, reporting, and school publications.

KENTUCKY: NASDTEC

LOUISIANA: in process of revision. Currently, no field specific criteria, although the standards for accrediting speak of a curriculum meeting "professional" standards.

MAINE: no data

MARYLAND: NASDTEC, 1971

MASSACHUSETTS: English, NASDTEC, 1968 (#351)

MICHIGAN: institutionally defined upon approval of State Board

MINNESOTA: the Speech-Theatre Arts major, must complete 30 semester hours in 1 of 3 ways: 1) a speech-theatre arts major (18 semester hours, introductory; 12 advanced). 2) all in speech; 3) all in theatre. See their handbook, pp. 33-35.

MISSISSIPPI: Speech, 24 semester hours, 6 may be in English, the remainder to include: speech fundamentals, public speaking, oral interpretation, dramatics, and 12 hours of electives.

MISSOURI: SPEECH AND DRAMATICS, at the secondary level to consist of: 8 credits of composition, rhetoric and grammar, 18 credits in speech and dramatics, 4 elective English and Speech credit.

MONTANA: currently under review. For speech: 15 quarter hours, if also endorsed in English, Speech-drama, or Dramatics.

NEBRASKA: Speech: speech fundamentals and public speaking; dramatic production and the oral reading of literature; principles of voice improvement including a study of phonetics, principles and techniques of discussion, argumentation, and debate; radio and/or television broadcasting or production; conduct or co-curricular speech activities in debate, discussion, speech contest and festiv ls, theatre, and radio and television production.

NEVADA: Speech, major equals 24 credits, minor 16; or, comprehensive field (English=Speech or Speech-Drama) a major consists of 36 credits, a minor of 24.

NEW HAMPSHIRE: NASDTEC

NEW JERSEY: NASDTEC, 1971 (subject certification for all grades)

NEW MEXICO: two programs fulfill accreditation in speech: 1) 24 credits in the Language Arts area (English, Speech, Drama, Reading, or Journalism), with at least 10 in speech and/or drama; 2) 24 credits in speech and/or drama.

NEW YORK: no certification in speech, except as a part of English and that's not specified.

NORTH CAROLINA: Speech Communication, the following guidelines are set forth: 1) the program should provide a knowledge of and skill in the traditional performance areas of speech; 2) program should introduce the student to the area of interpersonal communication theory; 3) the program should introduce the student to the basic problems of speech and the theory of speech correction; 4) the program should introduce the student to basic knowledge of the theatre arts; 5) the program should establish an awareness of general school activity and the part that speech communications can play in enlarging learning throughout the school spectrum; 6) the program should include sufficient preparation for the later pursuit of graduate work in one or more of the specialized fields within speech communications; the program should develop the capacity and the disposition for continued learning in the field of speech.

NORTH DAKOTA: not legally authorized to set standards, but must accept the requirements of any NCATE approved college program.'

OHIO: Communications, comprehensive, 60 semester hours, 27 credits in English, 18 in speech and drama, or vice versa; 9 in journalism, 6 reading.

OKLAHOMA: Speech, a minimum of 18 credits, no other specifications.

OREGON: Effective 1974, speech will be deleted as separate certification. To teach speech, the teacher must have completed 27 quarter hours in the basic language arts norm (literature, communication: written, oral (speech, film, television, or drama), and language study (general and cultural linguistics); 15 quarter hours in speech including discussion techniques, oral interpretation, argumentative speech, and forensics.

PENNSYLVANIA: Communication. Fulfillment of the following standards:

I.

1. understanding of the nature and functions of the communication process.
2. understanding of the processes of language learning and the development of language and communication skills.
3. understanding of the historical development and present characteristics of the English language.
4. understanding and appreciation of representative and appropriate works from a variety of literatures.
5. ability to listen, observe and speak effectively, in informal and formal situations.
6. ability to read critically and write effectively for varying purposes.
7. ability to teach others to listen, observe, speak, read and write effectively for different purposes under varying circumstances.
8. ability to assist students in integrating their communication skills and concepts with varieties of aesthetic experiences.

II.

a specifically designed program in one or more of the following areas: linguistic science, speech, literature, writing, theatre or non-print media. (note letter)

RHODE ISLAND: NASDTEC

SOUTH CAROLINA: Speech and Drama: 18 credits, including: speech fundamentals, public speaking, acting, dramatic production, dramatic literature or history, and one elective.

SOUTH DAKOTA: NASDTEC, #351, 1968. No speech program per se.

TENNESSEE: Speech: a minimum of 21 quarter hours in speech to include such courses as Fundamentals of Public Speaking, Oral Interpretation, Debate, Discussion, and Drama. Applicants offering 36 quarter hours in English and 18 quarter hours in speech may be certified in both.

TEXAS: institutionally defined (state approved); preparation to teach 2 subjects, 24 credits in each (including 12 credits of advanced work in each subject). The 48 hours in speech may include drama, but must include at least 24 credits in speech.

UTAH: NASDTEC, 1971

VERMONT: English; speech is incorporated into certification requirements for English; selected areas of emphasis in English may include (hours not specified): journalism, dramatics, debate and forensics, media.

VIRGINIA: Speech (12 credits, public speaking): English and Speech, 36 credits, 6 in speech.

WASHINGTON: Three types of certificates: teacher, administrator, educational staff associate. Endorsement is based on specialized competence, and that is determined by the consortium. These guidelines provide a framework within which trends and changes can be more readily incorporated into preparation programs. They encourage broad participation, honor the open-system concept, and decentralize responsibility and accountability for preparation and the outcomes of preparation.

WEST VIRGINIA: Speech: 24 semester hours, including: speech science, public address, oral interpretation, speech correction, dramatics, and 3 credits of electives. Or, a combined program in English, 50 hours, 15 in speech; 5 in journalism.

WISCONSIN: NASDTEC, 1971

WYOMING: Speech, 30 hours of English, 18 in speech and dramatic arts.

National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC, 1971)

SPEECH

1. The program shall provide for competencies in the areas of speech fundamentals, public address, oral interpretation, dramatics, and simple speech problems.
2. The program shall provide for the development of personal proficiency in oral communication.
3. The program shall include experience with dialects and other regionalisms, regarding their origin, development, and place in contemporary culture.

National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC, 1971)

ENGLISH. The following standards pertain to college programs for preparing English teachers.

STANDARD I The program shall include study in the various means of communication such as speaking, listening, reading and writing.

STANDARD II The program shall provide a fundamental knowledge of the historical development and present character of the English language: phonology (phonetics and phonemics), morphology, syntax, vocabulary (etymology and semantics), and metalinguistics (relations or language and society - for example, usage).

STANDARD III The program shall develop a reading background of major works from literature; emphasis on English and American literature; familiarity with outstanding non-English works in English translation; contemporary literature; literature appropriate for adolescents.

STANDARD IV The program shall include opportunities for the prospective teacher to have experience in the teaching of reading, journalism, dramatics, forensics, radio, television and film study and production.

DESCRIPTIONS OF CURRENT TEACHER PREPARATION MODELS AND POSSIBLE NEW MODELS FOR COMMUNICATION EDUCATION

Sharon A. Ratliffe
Western Michigan University

During the past decade, the focus of our discipline has deepened and broadened and changes in our field have emerged in the literature related to speech communication in the secondary school published in the past five years. As a profession, we have articulated a new depth of self-understanding by emphasizing the concept of process as the foundation of our discipline and by placing an increased emphasis on a receiver-orientation to speech communication. Recent methods textbooks written for use in preparing secondary school communication teachers incorporate these changes in varying degrees (Allen and Willmington, 1972; Braden, 1972, Brooks and Friedrich, 1973; Galvin and Book, 1972; Reid, 1972). The change in the very essence of what we are has been accompanied by a broadening of focus from an emphasis primarily on public speech to include emphases on the private moments when we communicate with ourselves (intrapersonal communication), when we communication with another and in small groups (interpersonal communication), and when we communicate in the large group and to the masses through formal public meetings, theatre, and radio, television, film (public communication). In addition to methods textbooks, texts designed for student use in the secondary school speech communication classroom reflect the intrapersonal-interpersonal-public communication continuum (Allen et al., 1968, Nadeau, 1972; Ratliffe and Herman, 1972). State and professional association curriculum guides (e.g. Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Nebraska, Michigan and Washington) as well as journal articles (e.g., Anderson and Anderson, 1972; Braden, 1970; Buys et al., 1968) add to the literature focusing on secondary school speech communication that incorporates the changing focus of our discipline (Ratliffe, 1972).

Unfortunately, especially in light of our task at the conference, the literature in our field does not appear to include reports of current, comprehensive studies (1) of what speech communication is actually taught in the public and private secondary schools of our fifty states; (2) of existing teacher preparation curricula in the college and university speech communication departments throughout the country that prepare secondary school speech communication teachers; (3) of the certification standards and the degree to which they are enforced in each of the fifty states; and (4) of the job descriptions of those secondary school teaching and administrative positions -- not necessarily only speech communication positions — filled by persons who hold a major, minor, and/or graduate degree in speech communication. So it is with only a partial picture at best (Brooks, 1969) that we set out in the true spirit of process to specify recommendations that will help our field determine the roles and preparation of future secondary school communication teachers that will be consonant with the essence of our changing discipline. To provide input for our deliberations, I will (1) discuss current teacher preparation models, (2) specifically suggest what appear to me to be essential components of future teacher preparation models for communication teachers, and (3) make three specific recommendations

Current Teacher Preparation Models

The primary generating force for teacher preparation models for secondary school speech communication teachers is the college or university speech communication department with the departmental model articulated within the rubric of the respective college or university's school of education model designed for training all secondary school teachers. The typical model includes (1) a major or minor in speech communication, (2) a methods course offered within the speech communication department, and (3) the student teaching experience accompanied by educational theory and practicum courses usually designed and taught by faculty in the school of education. The degree of input by speech communication faculty during the student teaching contact varies widely from no participation at all to regular contact during the sequence of education courses.

The methods course taught within the speech communication department is often primarily theoretical in focus, is usually taken by teacher-trainees in their junior or senior year immediately prior to the student teaching experience, and may be the only professional course regularly offered by the speech communication department designed specifically for prospective teachers. In some cases, prior to the student teaching experience, competent high school teachers are invited to campus to teach or share in the teaching of the methods course or to conduct seminars for prospective teachers (e.g., Caruso, 1972) for the purpose of supplementing the teaching of the college of university faculty member responsible for training teachers but who may have no recent high school teaching experience. Perhaps less frequently, teachers of the methods course may teach high school speech communication courses. However, in my experience, it is rare for the teacher-trainee to be regularly and systematically placed in a variety of high school classroom experiences prior to the student teaching experience.

Our current teacher preparation models are subject to both student and faculty criticism. We hear that the student teaching experience, frequently the only experiential component of the teacher preparation model, lacks reality; that methods teachers have little or no practical teaching experience in the high school classroom; that preparation to teach the culturally disadvantaged and low achieving students is unrealistic; that the speech methods, resources, and curricula recommended in the university methods course are not clearly articulated into the actual total high school curriculum (Applebaum and Applebaum, 1971; Moseley, 1971).

In addition to the literature in our field related to secondary school speech communication and the nature of teaching positions in the secondary school, the design of teacher preparation models in college and university speech communication departments is influenced to some extent by state certification codes and professional standards recommended by our professional associations. While these influences are closely linked to competency-based teacher preparation, the subject of another session at this conference, it seems appropriate to recognize them here.

State certification codes provide minimum standards below which any teacher supposedly would be considered incompetent to teach. In a recent survey of the

thirteen state departments of education in the region of the Central States Speech Association (Ratliffe, 1973), it was found that all thirteen states identify a minimum number of credit hours as the subject matter requirement with some states (e.g., Indiana) identifying specific areas such as public speaking, discussion and debate, dramatics and oral interpretation, radio and television, and speech sciences and correction in which definite numbers of credit hours must be taken. Other states (e.g., Michigan) simply state the number of total hours required in speech. Some states (e.g., Minnesota) identify separate certification tracks for speech and for theatre. In addition to the content area requirements, the supervised student teaching sequence is uniformly required along with whatever additional education courses are included by the specific university or college approved by a state board of education to offer a degree in teacher education. In general, state certification codes promote current college and university teacher preparation models by promoting the concept that enrolling in a series of courses is a viable index of teaching competency in the various content fields.

The standards recommended by professional associations are typically more demanding than state certification codes. The 1963 SAA Principles and Standards for Certification of Secondary School Speech Teachers describes the competent speech teacher as one who understands the various aspects of speech, is able to execute curricular and co-curricular duties, and is able to demonstrate personal proficiency in oral and written communication, a functional knowledge of the discipline, and effective classroom management (SAA Subcommittee on Curricula and Certification, 1963). However, once again, the implication is that completing courses is a viable index of competency in teaching speech communication, for the 1963 SAA recommended teacher preparation model includes the completion of at least eighteen semester hours in speech in an accredited college or university plus a methods course in speech and the supervise student teaching experience.

Similarly, the more recent SCA standards which were adopted by SCA and recommended for implementation in September, 1972, propose that the teacher of speech courses have a major in speech, complete a master's degree in the first five years of teaching, and be certified to teach only those courses in which he has academic preparation. Separate standards for the director of speech activities recommend at least a minor in speech and certification to direct only those activities in which he has had academic preparation and practical experience. Once again, it seems to me, we have perpetuated the concept that "because a prospective teacher has had an academic course or practical experience in public speaking, acting, reading aloud, etc., he is intellectually and emotionally prepared to teach it to others."

Last year, at the SCA Summer Conference, you may recall that in discussing speech communication and career education, Cornelius Butler, Deputy Commissioner for the US Office of Education, stated that "...education has the responsibility for placing students into contexts that are not antecendents. In other words, education is not an anticipatory process." He added," The student must develop stronger feelings that he is controlling his own destiny." Current teacher preparation models are probably guilty of anticipatory education since by and

large they are designed so that students are placed into contexts that are antecedents and to the degree that this is true, students probably experience a limited sense of control over their own destiny. Dr. Aubrey Moseley, a teacher in the public schools and in the Department of Education at Middle Tennessee State University, identified as a major problem a discrepancy between the role of the teacher as identified in the public schools and as defined in teacher training institutions. Dr. Moseley reported that some school superintendents retrain most of their first year teachers before they can teach in the school system (Moseley, 1971). Such retraining was a major goal of the superintendent of education in Kalamazoo, Michigan last year.

In sum, the simplistic, basically non-experiential major, minor, credit hour accumulation syndrome that is at the heart of our current teacher preparation models does not live up to the experiential, process nature of our discipline.

Possible New Models for Communication Education

Being given the opportunity to be critical of present conditions carries with it the obligation to suggest positive alternatives for the immediate future. I will attempt to do so by identifying, in my opinion, what should become essential characteristics of our future teacher preparation models. It seems to me that one of the strengths of our professional standards and the state codes has been the flexibility of allowing colleges and universities to develop programs appropriate to their life style and to the student population and geographical region they serve. The essence of future models will probably be a focus upon competencies -- not necessarily courses -- essential to the teaching of communication combined with the flexibility of individualized plans of course work and experience for teacher-trainees that cover a period of time to be terminated when the competencies are achieved. Future models may bring the demise of the major and minor as primary indices of "what it takes" to prepare and to become an effective communication teacher.

According to Brooks and Friedrich, a good teacher is "...one who so manages the educational process under his charge that the result is efficient and significant learning -- change in behavior -- by the students."[1] The components of the instructional system include each student's capabilities, course objectives, instructional strategies, and the evaluation and measurement of progress. The management of this system, we would agree, is the responsibility of the teacher and in large measure depends on that teacher-student relationship. Teacher preparation models of the past have relegated the primary element in the system, experience with the high school student in the high school classroom, to the final year of the prospective teacher's preparation. Viable future models must include a shift of the student teaching experience from the periphery to the core of the teacher preparation model so that early and frequent experience in secondary school classrooms is provided to teacher-trainees. One educator predicts that the prospective teacher -- not necessarily of communication -- will move through a series of sequential experiential roles including teacher aide, participant observer assisting teacher, associate teacher, intern teacher, extern teacher, and career teacher (Robbins, 1971).

If this experiential component were to become the core of our future teacher preparation models, then at least three additional components would begin to emerge:

1. If we include as essential the regular participation of teacher-trainees in ther secondary school classroom, then it is necessary and implicit that the responsibility for designing teacher preparation models, currently assumed primarily by college and university faculty, be broadened to include equal input in the decision-making process by secondary school administrators and teachers. Professor Robbins, Dean of Professional Studies at Moorhead State College, Minnesota, predicts that "Under cooperative arrangements, qualified public school administrators and faculty members will become full partners in the program and process. They will assume full and equal status with their colleagues in higher education as teacher educators."[2]

2. Spreading the student teaching experience throughout the teacher preparation program implies either early commitment on the part of the student to the program or a willingness to remain in college as long as is necessary beyond the typical four year program to complete a sequence of courses and experiences designed to help him achieve stated competencies in teaching communication. Once teacher competencies for our field are identified, early contact with the teacher-trainee enables diagnosis of the trainees' competencies (e.g., attitudes, skills, content knowledge, and interests) so that a highly individualized program of courses and experiences might be designed to meet his needs. (Indeed, the student might discover early in his college career that he might not have either the interest or the competencies for teaching communication in the secondary school.)

3. Regular and varied experience in the secondary school classroom coupled with early contact with teacher-trainees would tend to eliminate the methods course as we know it and fuse the content of such a course into the total experiental segment of the model. The fusion of the methods and experiential components should result in more rigorous standards for college and university faculty members responsible for preparing communication teachers. This faculty should be competent in teaching communication at the secondary school level.

While it appears that there might be any number of combinations of teacher preparation models designed to effectively prepare competent communication teachers, these characteristics seem to me to be essential components of all models. It also follows, in my opinion, that an important role SCA might play is to publicly endorse as preferred teacher preparation institutions those schools whose teacher preparation models include and maintain these and possible other essential characteristics. In a period of a tight job market and falling college enrollments it would seem that such endorsement would be highly sought after by college and university speech communication departments who propose to prepare communication teachers for the secondary school. In describing a teacher preparation model involving components similar to those described here, Dean Robbins predicts that:

> Certification of teachers and state accreditation of teacher education programs will no longer be the sole prerogative of state legislatures and state boards and departments of education. The certification and accreditation process within the state will be a cooperative enterprise involving joint and legal collaboration of professional associations, teacher preparing institutions, local school organizations, and the state legal authorities.[3]

Specific Recommendations

Based upon this analysis, I would like to propose three recommendations for your consideration:

1. That we recommend that Airlie Recommendation E-3 regarding minimum certification standards for teachers be focused on competency based standards not only for secondary school communication teachers but also for the college faculty who provide professional preparation for secondary school communication teachers.

2. That we recommend that Airlie Recommendation E-7 regarding the facilitation of exchanges of resident professors should explicitly be expanded to include the exploration of exchanges between K-12 teachers and university faculty responsible for preparing K-12 teachers.

3. That we recommend that the Educational Policies Board of SCA establish a committee whose task is to identify characteristics essential to teacher preparation models for communication teachers and then to solicit applications from college and university departments of speech and communication that incorporate those characteristics in their teacher preparation models. A reasonable number of these college and university programs should then be named as experimental communication teacher training centers sanctioned by the SCA. Funding should be sought and educators and researchers at these centers should begin (1) to identify the roles and test the competencies believed to be important in teaching communication in the secondary school; (2) to employ and evaluate a variety of secondary school teacher-college and university faculty-lay personnel-high school student-teacher trainee relationships; (3) to explore possible political-legal arrangements between SCA, colleges and universities, secondary schools, and state boards and departments of education for certifying secondary school communication teachers.

The procedure for identifying essential characteristics and selecting college and university departments that incorporate the characteristics has precedence in the procedure used for selecting the four speech communication departments that are currently conducting the inservice institutes for secondary school speech communication teachers co-sponsored by SCA.

* * * * * * *

FOOTNOTES

Sharon A. Ratliffe, Assistant Professor Communication Arts and Sciences, Western Michigan University (Ph. D. Wayne State University, 1972).

FOOTNOTES (cont.)

[1]William D. Brooks and Gustav W. Friedrich, Teaching Speech Communication in the Secondary School (Boston; Houghton Mifflin Company, 1973), p. 9.

[2]Glaydon D. Robbins, "New Preparation for Teachers," The Educational Forum, XXXVI (November, 1971), p.101.

[3]Ibid., p. 102.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Allen, R. R.; Anderson, Sharol; and Hough, Jere. Speech in American Society. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1968.

_____, and Willmington, S. Clay. Speech Communication in the Secondary School. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

Braden, Waldo W., ed. Speech Methods and Resources: A Textbook for the Teacher of Speech. 2nd ed. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1972.

Brooks, William D., and Freidrich, Gustav W. Teaching Speech Communication in the Secondary School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Comapny, 1973.

Galvin, Kathleen M. , and Book, Cassandra L. Speech Communication: An Interpersonal Approach for Teachers. Skokie: National Textbook Company, 1972.

Nadeau, Ray E. Speech Communication: A Modern Approach. Menlo Park: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1972.

Ratliffe, Sharon A., and Herman, Deldee M. Adventures in the Looking-Glass: Experiences in Communication with Your-Self and Others. Skokie: National Textbook Company, 1972.

Reid, Loren. Teaching Speech. 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971.

Articles in Journals and Periodicals

Anderson, Loren J., and Anderson, Betty. "A 'Communications' Approach to High School Speech." Michigan Speech Association Journal, VII (1972), pp. 1-5.

Applebaum, Ronald L., and Applebaum, Susan J. "Advantages and Disadvantages of the Speech Methods Course in College." Today's Speech, XIX (Summer, 1971), pp. 41-43.

Braden, Waldo W., ed. Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals: Speech Communication in the Secondary School, LIV (December, 1970).

Brooks, William D. "The Status of Speech in the Secondary Schools: A Summary of State Studies." The Speech Teacher, XVIII (November, 1969), pp. 276-81.

Buys, William E., et al. "Speech Communication in the High School Curriculum." The Speech Teacher, XVII (November, 1968), pp. 297-317.

Caruso, Thelma. "High School Speech and English" A Communication Department," Today's Speech, XX(Fall, 1972), pp. 33-38.

Moseley, Aubrey H. "Teacher Education: The University and the Schools," Kappa Delta Pi Record, VIII (October, 1971) pp. 26-27.

Robbins, Glaydon D. "New Preparation for Teachers," The Educational Forum, XXXVI (November, 1971), pp. 99-102.

SAA Subcommittee on Curricula and Certification. "Principles and Standards for Certification of Teachers of Speech in Secondary Schools," The Speech Teacher, XII (November, 1963), pp. 336-337.

"SCA Certification Standards," SPECTRA, VII (June, 1971), p. 4.

Pamphlets

Basilico, Louis; Bender, Marcia; Berg, Roberta; Hladik, Robert; Mead, Linda; and Patterson, Arlis with guidance from Barbara L. Brilhart. A Curriculum Guide for Speech Communication-Grades 8-12. Nebraska Speech Association (1971).

Croll, George; Marx, Barbara; Meerson, Mary Lou; Nickles, Jerry; Ritzenhein, Donald; Troxell, Terry; and Yaudes, Ronald. Speech Communication in the High School. Michigan Speech Association Curriculum Guide Series, No. 3. Deldee M. Herman and Sharon A. Ratliffe, eds. Skokie: National Textbook Company, 1972.

Florida, Department of Education. Oral Communication. Bulletin No. 721. Division of Elementary and Secondary Education (1970).

Hawaii, Department of Education. Secondary Speech-Communication Guide. Office of Instructional Services (September, 1971).

Illinois, Department of Public Instruction. Communication in the High School Curriculum: Speaking and Listening. Rev. Subject Field Series, Bulletin D-1 (1971).

Washington, State Speech Association in Cooperation with the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Strategies for Change in Speech Communication. Washington State Department of Public Instruction (1972).

Unpublished Materials

Ratliffe, Sharon A. "A Comparative Analysis of Selected Methods Textbooks, Curriculum Guides, and Student Textbooks Intended for Use in Teaching the High School Basic Speech Course." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Wayne State University. 1972.

_____. " A Survey of the Certification Requirements for Speech Communication Teachers in the Thirteen States Within the Region of the Central States Speech Association. Unpublished Study. 1973.

PRACTICAL PROBLEMS ON THE STATE LEVEL IN TRANSACTIONS FROM OLD TO NEW TEACHER PREPARATION MODELS

Charles V. Carlson
Ohio University

On January 1, 1972 the laws and regulations governing speech teacher education and certification in Ohio changed significantly. A new comprehensive field in Communication was added to the existing speech certification programs. Speech was raised from a minor preparatory teaching field to a major one. The suggested minimum distribution of speech course coverage replace the specified course-counting. And the speech certification criterion was organized by the nature of the field, rather than by the more traditional academic areas.

For almost three years members of the Speech Communication Association of Ohio met in small groups and in large, in harmony and in discord, in-house and with outside lay, educational and professional organizations. The purpose of all these efforts was to help "share the responsibility for evaluating and improving the quality of teacher education."[1]

The purpose of this paper is to share some of the ways the problems in the transaction from the old to the new teacher preparation model in Ohio were met. The concerns have been grouped into the areas of procedures, policies, and philosophy. Hopefully the ideas mentioned in these few pages will serve as a useful base for identifying problems, and suggesting solutions to certification questions nationally, regionally, and on the state level.

Although the concerns of philosophy, and policy are important issues in teacher preparation and certification the basic difficulties in upgrading speech standards in Ohio seemed to be procedural. Only incidentally were efforts made to provide input on the status of the speech teacher to the Ohio Department of Education. For example, from the early fifties until 1967 there were no planned efforts to make improvements in speech teacher education through certification through a representative speech organization.

The question of who is to do what, when, and in what way began in 1967 when the State Board of Education authorized the appointment of an Advisory Council, the Executive Committee of the Speech Communication Association of Ohio assigned speech certification duties to its Public School Cooperation Committee. These two bodies worked together to draw-up the general guidelines, and negotiated the speech certification standards.

The Advisory Council named to its membership individuals who represented higher education, public and nonpublic schools, and the general citizenry of Ohio. This committee met almost monthly for three years. The appointment of the Advisory Council helped not only with the information gathering and dissemination, but met the legal expectations as well. In Ohio the State Board of Education is directed by state law "...to adopt public regulations governing teacher certification in accordance with statutory administrative procedure;...include standards and courses of study for the preparation of teachers together with the standards, rules, and regulations set for each grade and type of certificate and for renewal and [illegible] thereof."[2]

During the early summer of 1967 the Advisory Council sponsored a Conference on Teacher Preparation. Representatives from Ohio colleges and universities, elementary-secondary schools, professional and educational organizations, and lay groups were invited to participate. Persons who attended this meeting in Columbus (the state speech organization was represented) were asked to encourage their specific interest groups to prepare written recommendations for improving teacher preparation generally, and specifically in their teaching area by late 1968. A follow-up conference was held almost a year later, April 27, 1968.

The SCAO responded to the Advisory Council invitation to participate in the teacher education and certification by naming the Public School Cooperation Committee (a standing committee) to wrestle with the problem. This Committee was assigned the duties of (1) studying existing state standards in speech and recommendations for standards by national and regional speech associations, (2) soliciting suggestions for certification from speech and theatre teachers at all levels of education, and (3) preparing a written proposal which would include minimum standards based on a rationale. This Committee was to report directly and monthly to the Executive Council of SCAO.[3]

The fact finding procedure began on April 29, 1968 when an open-ended questionnaire was sent to over 400 teachers of speech at both the elementary-secondary and the college levelswho were members of the SCAO. Teachers were asked to respond to the question, "What changes, if any, would you make in the preparation of Ohio teachers of speech?" A copy of existing standards was included for purposes of reference. Ten high school and ten college teachers of speech responded. Five teachers indicated that there should be no change, and fifteen thought standards should be changed in some way.[4]

Other fact finding procedures included a meeting with the State Directors of Speech in the state universities, and a Conference on Speech Certification. The Directors were asked for suggestions for certification at their May 1968 meeting. Higher standards were recommended. The prevailing opinion of the over 100 teachers of speech and theatre who attended the Kent State Conference was to upgrade speech standards.

The ideas about certification that had been suggested at the various meetings and conversations were given to the Chairman of the Public School Cooperation Committee, Charles V. Carlson, after the Fall Conference of the SCAO in 1968. The first draft of the proposal was written in October and a copy was sent the same month to each member of the Committee as well as the Executive Council Each member of both groups read the proposal and returned suggestions for revision to the Chairman. A second draft was submitted to both groups in early November. Recommendations were finalized at the Executive Council meeting the same month, and the Chairman of the Committee was authorized to prepare and distribute the final copy.

Copies of The Ohio Speech Association Recommendations on Certification,[5] a fourteen page report, were sent to the Ohio Department of Certification during

the first week in December 1968. This Department had the responsibility for distributing copies of the recommendations to the appropriate groups and individuals, including members of the Advisory Council. Copies were also distributed from the Speech Communication Resource Center of the Ohio University to members of the Association who requested them.

The final procedure included a follow-through program. The Public School Cooperation Committee held private meetings with the Chairman of the Advisory Council, and the Director of Certification to review SCAO recommendations, answer questions, and get progress reports on other certification activities. These sessions were arranged about every six weeks from early in 1969 through May, 1970.

Final agreements were reached at the Advisory Council Open Hearings on May 12 and 13, 1970. The Public School Cooperation Committee was given a half hour on the second day to present the case for speech certification. Two college and one high school teacher represented the Association. The speech representatives gave special attention to the growth of speech as a field of study in recent years. Handout materials, including descriptions of courses offered by colleges and universities in Ohio were given to each Advisory Council Member. Research studies revealing the importance of speech, and its neglect were reviewed. The Council not only approved the recommendations but raised the minimum recommended hours from twenty-four to thirty.

On October 10, 1970 the Ohio Board of Education help open hearings on the recommendations of the Advisory Council. The Chairman of the Public School Cooperation Committee of SCAO was invited to speak in favor of the new guidelines at the Hearings. The Board passed unanimously the new certification package, which included speech.

Policies were another important consideration in Ohio certification. How could a teacher preparation program be designed that would meet a variety of needs, both individual and institutional? What is the best way to provide for competency? How should teacher preparation programs be approved? And how should standards be changed in the future?

Ohio elected to continue the three avenues of work to determine teacher competency. This program includes (1) courses in professional education, (2) courses in general education, and (3) courses in a teaching field or area. Professional education includes work in learning theory, educational philosophy, and curriculum. General education includes work in math and science, the English language, art and philosophy, social studies, and health and physical education. The teaching area or field includes concentrated study in one of the academic areas, such as speech.

The SCAO was interested in all three areas, and for different reasons. Since the area of professional education included the speech methods course, questions were raised about instructional competency at the college area. Should the methods course, such as speech methods, be considered general, and include

teachers from a variety of areas; or should it be a course for methods in one area only? Should the course be taught by a person experienced in secondary education? What was going to determine the topics covered in the course? The Advisory Council felt that these problems could best be handled by each institution developing its own guidelines, and then approve or reject these programs in negotiated meetings with the Department of Certification.

The course work in the second area, general education (both elementary and secondary) includes the area of English. Prospective teachers who are not concentrating in English would at least be exposed to what the area has to offer, and hopefully certain teacher deficiencies might be minimized through the study. Historically, the English Association of Ohio recommends the content area of study in this section. The SCAC held two meetings with the representatives of the English Association to review the recommendations. The guidelines suggest that English at the elementary level include the English language and linguistics, literature (including children's literature) and speech. No specific areas were recommended at the secondary level, although the general practice throughout the state is to have all teachers take at least one speech course, usually public speaking.

The third avenue is the teaching field (secondary) or teaching area(elementary). The purpose of this avenue is to continue, encourage, or develop in-depth study in one teaching field or area. First, choices of programs to meet both individual and societal needs were recommended. Two certificates are offered at the secondary level, and one for the elementary-secondary teacher. The Speech Specific Certificate was continued, and the Communication Comprehensive Certificate was developed. The teacher is approved to teach only speech with the first certificate, but may teach speech, English, Journalism, and Reading, separately or in combination with the second certificate. The first is a thirty semester hour program, and the latter is a sixty semester hour program.

The next policy consideration concerned the structure within the teaching field which would help in the question of competency. The Association recommended that course work be well distributed over three areas: (1) fundamental processes, (2) theory and history, and (3) forms of speech. Fundamental processes should include work in speech and electives in basic speech processes (physics of sound, listening, phonetics, semantics, and linguistics). Included in theory and history are two areas: communication media theory (communication, rhetorical, psychological, argumentation, and theatrical), and communication media history (public address, radio-television, and theatre). Forms of speech includes oral interpretation, public address (platform speaking, discussion, and debate) and theatre(acting, play direction and technical theatre).

Another policy consideration involved the proposal to have colleges and universities establish flexible and innovative approaches to teacher education, and to approve the program of each institution on an individual basis, but within the guidelines established as standards for the state. In Ohio, the over thirty institutions interested in teacher training differ in size, in curriculum,

in personnel, in the level of instruction, and in student interest and needs. For example some speech departments include both speech and theatre, others do not. Some are performance oriented. Others are directed more toward public communication. No one plan was considered best.

The last policy dealt with the question of up-dating and revision. Historically, the process of certification was raised about once every ten years, and then all areas were reviewed at the same time. Teacher preparation, and certification is now an on-going process. Each area of teacher preparation and certification can be examined when necessary, and independently from the others.

The final topic conerns philosophy. Most participants involved in the teacher certification deliberations in Ohio seemed to believe that the quality of the teacher is the key to a good education. Curriculum and facilities were identified, but labeled as tools of teaching. The student was viewed as the learner in the educational process.

Most conferences were too large in number and/or too varied in interests to discuss the implications of such a philosophy. What are the teacher qualities, and which ones make a difference in instruction? Where does speech figure in when quality is a consideration?

Most persons who worked on the Ohio teacher preparation model agreed that speech and teaching were related, but had difficulty conceptualizing speech beyond the lecture method. Speech tended to be equated with personality, and "that was formed early in life." Most persons not trained in the field of speech were unwilling to discuss such topics as "speech, sex roles, and teaching," or "speech and the teaching culture." Each interest group was given the responsibility of applying the general philosophy about teacher quality to its own area. The question of speech as an art and as a science indicates the problems within the field, and the difficulty of generating a single philosophy.

How does a speech teacher preparation program deal with the question of job opportunities? Has such a program of raising standards priced the speech teacher out of the job market? The answer is "not so far." A number of colleges and universities were already significantly above the state minimum, and speech students in these programs were able to work out dual certification. Achievement performance of these students ought to be considered normative. Secondly, speech is a significant subject, and ought to be offered in the high school curriculum as frequently as literature and math. Thirdly, the teacher preparation and certification programs should help make teachers feel like first class, not second class, citizens.

Footnotes

[1]Martin W. Essex, Laws and Regulations Governing Teacher Education and Certification, Ohio Department of Education, January 1, 1972, p. iii.

[2]Baldwin's Ohio School Law, Sixth Edition Banks-Baldwin, Cleveland, 1966, p. 604.

[3]Charles V. Carlson, "Certification Changes For The Prospective Speech Teacher in Ohio," The Ohio Speech Journal, Vol. 3, 1971, p. 21.

[4]"Preliminary Report: Reaction To The Question, What Changes Would You Make In The Speech Certificate In The State Of Ohio," Unpublished Document, Resource Center For Speech Communication, Ohio University, Athens, May 24, 1968, pp.1-2.

[5]"The Ohio Speech Association Recommendations On Certification," Unpublished Document, Resource Center For Speech Communication, Ohio University, Athens, December 1, 1968.

PROBLEMS OF TEACHER PREPARATION IN COMMUNICATION EDUCATION: A SECONDARY TEACHER'S VIEWPOINT

Dean Frost
Irving Junior High School, Lincoln, Nebraska

My many thanks to the persons responsible for this summer conference and the opportunity to contribute my thoughts. Here in Chicago with its magnificant new skyline dominated by what is the world's tallest structure, let us strive to surpass that height in ideas that will enhance the future of speech communication.

If a worthwhile contribution blushes unseen and wastes its sweetness on the deserts of silence, everyone is poorer. Most of us likely have had the experience of engaging in stimulating conversation after the main discussion. We discover from that person a number of interesting observations and ideas.

Unfortunately, many teachers while being trained or while in the process of continuing education after certification, do not concern themselves with their preparation and take no part in the main discussion toward what should be implemented to reflect administrative reorganization of the discipline occurring at the university level. The blame, if there is one to be placed, is about equal: the teacher should speak out and the administrator should seek out.

My purpose is to deal specifically with "Problems of Teacher Preparation in Communication Education: A Secondary Teacher's Viewpoint."

In preparing this presentation, a quote long forgotten, but suddenly remembered came to mind: "Uncritical lovers make little contributions." It is entirely possible that speech teachers who are noncritical make no contributions. While they may make valuable contributions in the classroom, they leave barren by their silence the fertile field of relationships among new university programs, potential secondary speech programs and needed teacher preparation.

Two questions will be raised about new policies and procedures that reflect administrative reorganization of the discipline at the university level. Part of the success of what we accomplish here may be found in the ways in which we answer those questions.

The first question secondary teachers need to ask is: what will be our identification? Are we going to operate as a discipline or as a profession or both? Dean Robert B. Howsam, University of Houston, points this out very specifically by using a continuum. Research in arts and sciences is at one end of the continuum; application in teachers college in the middle; and the use which occurs in the classroom when the door is closed is at the other end of the continuum.

Surely much time can be spent on theory as the many articles in communication oriented publications prove. But how will the theory, fine as it may be, relate to the classroom teacher on the use side of the continuum when the classroom door is closed?

Books and articles on theory are necessary, but we expect all teachers to operate within communications models in their own classrooms. And remember this certainly includes teachers at the university level. It is or should be expected of university instructors or professors to exemplify what they explicate. In simpler language: practice what they preach.

Research indicates arts and science is responsible for approximately four-fifth's of all course work undertaken by students in colleges of education. This means that if a 125 hour requirement is met for certification, approximately 100 hours are in arts and science and 25 in education. In that relatively short period of dealing with future educators, how vital it is that college educators use effective communication models to communicate in the classroom.

Dr. Paul Olson, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, said: "We cannot defend the communication of theory for its own sake. Theory is only efficacious if transferable."

Remember that knowledge for the sake of knowledge is not valuable for teachers. Knowledge alone has never made a teacher. It is important for a teacher to be a scholar, but a scholar cannot necessarily teach. The ability to combine the scholar and the teacher will often come after the university level educator holds a mirror to his teaching techniques and theories and stops asking: "Mirror, mirror on the wall. Who is the fairest of them all?"

It is essential that all teachers on all levels pay attention to the audience they are trying to reach and practice what they preach. Why not take that straight line continuum which has at one end research, application in teachers college in the middle and classroom use at the other end and bend it into a circle. Allow teachers to operate within that circle of knowledge as both a profession and as a discipline.

It can be done if we will only take time to restructure the years-old image of the college educator in an ivory tower with drawbridge and moat. Fill in the moat with understanding, lower the drawbridge of theory and invite the potential teachers into the main room of the tower. The second question secondary teachers must raise is: what preservice at the university level and inservice experience will we engage in to keep abreast of changing communication models?

If universities only reflect preparation for the preservice person--those engaged in obtaining a degree for certification -- what happens to the vast number of secondary teachers trained many years ago under entirely different concepts? A method must be found to reach inservice persons -- those now teaching -- with new communication models to prevent obsolescence.

A new model is developed and accepted, a new textbook is written, a curriculum devised, but the audience to which those ideas are aimed is not retrained. To what avail is it all?

It is that worthwhile contribution blushing unseen, wasting its sweetness on the desert with everyone the poorer.

It has been found that teachers become very bored with curriculum just handed to them like a leaflet from a stranger passed on the street. Any rigid standard puts an end to creative production. It is desirable for the teacher to identify with the creative intentions of pupils. Is it any less desirable for university level educators or those formulating curriculum to identify with creative teachers as the secondary level teacher attempts to identify with students?

Again referring to the continuum mentioned earlier: remember that use occurs at the end of that continuum in the classroom when the door is shut. Thus instructional decisions which enhance development and learning are ultimately used only by those dealing directly with students.

The approach must be threefold: rewrite textbooks on a regular basis; present curriculum suggestions, not rigid principles; and stimulate cooperation among university arts and science departments, university secondary education departments and public school systems to insure continued inservice preparation after the degree has been earned.

This last approach would insure flexible, more adaptable institutions. Our professional organization should set as a goal inservice for teachers through state regional and national conferences. More use should be made of the talents of secondary teachers in the conferences as is done by the National Council of Teachers of English and as this conference is doing. Encouragement should be given to better cooperation of the university education and arts and sciences departments and the public schools.

To my fellow conference participants and to all who may read this presentation, a challenge is offered: when we have answered satisfactorily the question of what is our identification--discipline, profession or both--and the question of what exemplary preservice and inservice experience will be provided for teachers, then, and only then, will we obtain some measure of control over the complex factors which influence students. And we will have dealt more effectively with new problems of teacher preparation in communication education!

A work of art is not the representation of the thing, it is the representation of the experience we have with the thing. Think of the preparation of a teacher as that work of art: experiences change without subjective relation to the environment as well as with the materials through which these relationships are expressed.

Teacher preparation must be in terms to which a preservice person can relate and later use behind the closed classroom door. At the same time, inservice persons with their knowledge must be used to insure not only their competency, but that of others.

REPORT OF THE RESEARCH PRIORITIES DIVISION

Overview

Lloyd F. Bitzer, Director

The central problem areas discussed by Research Division conferees were selected on the recommendation of the SCA Research Board (Lloyd F. Bitzer, Herbert Simons, and John W. Bowers). The members of the Board had studied the Airlie Conference Report and concluded that three areas of inquiry would be particularly timely and appropriate for Summer Conference discussion.

The first area selected was "The Future of Communication Research." Numerous Airlie recommendations related to this area; but in addition, the Board though that the future of SCA would be influenced in important ways by what we say we are doing when we engage in "communication research." And this is why, we thought, a most appropriate topic of discussion would deal with both what communication research will become and what communication research should become in the future. Gerald R. Miller, former Chairman of the Research Board and a participant in the Airlie Conference, consented to chair the group that would discuss The Future of Communication Research.

The second area selected was "Research Dealing with Models of Decision-Making." In selecting this area, the Board was responding directly to a specific charge in the Airlie Conference Report, namely Recommendation O-5:

> The Legislative Council should establish a task force to propose and field-test participatory modes of decision-making for large, non-face-to-face groups. The task force will implement this recommendation as follows:
>
> 1) Undertake research into the literature of mass participation in goal-setting and decision-making, and set up site visits where community and organization groups are making efforts in this direction.
> 2) Propose several alternative or complementary procedures to facilitate membership participation in SCA goal-setting and decision-making.
> 3) Arrange a field test by applying recommended procedures to specific issues or decision areas for a specific term, with appropriate tests of effectiveness.
> 4) Adopt the procedures passing the effectiveness tests with or without amendments to the constitution or by-laws.
> 5) Make appropriate efforts to disseminate the results of the research to relevant publics.
>
> Implementation: The Legislative Council will be asked in December, 1972, to establish the task force on participatory modes of decision-making called for.

P R O C E E D I N G S

Speech Communication Association
Summer Conference IX

Long Range Goals and Priorities in Speech Communication

Palmer House Hotel, Chicago, Illinois
July 12-14, 1973

Edited By
Robert C. Jeffrey
and
William Work

Speech Communication Association
Statler Hilton Hotel
New York, New York 10001

PREFACE

In September 1972, the Speech Communication Association sponsored a conference at Airlie House, Virginia to consider long-range goals and priorities for the Association and the profession. The seventeen conferees at the Airlie Conference generated a report (published in the April, 1973 issue of Spectra) that was widely discussed at the 1972 SCA Convention in December. The Legislative Council at that convention approved plans for the 1973 Summer Conference to expand upon the "Airlie Report."

The basic purpose of the Ninth Annual SCA Summer Conference was to extend the impact of the Airlie Conference by democratizing participation. The planners of the Conference predicted that those attending would contribute significantly to thought about the future of the profession by further defining goals, designing implementation strategies, and establishing priorities. To that end, all members of the SCA were invited to participate.

Since the "Airlie Report" presented recommendations in three broad areas—Education, Research, and Futurism—, the major divisions of the Conference were arranged to reflect those areas. Participants in Division A considered Education priorities, those in Division B dealt with Research priorities and those in Division C reflected on Futuristic priorities. Divisions A and B were each further organized into three Groups and Division C into two Groups. Participants, upon registering for the Conference, were asked to select the Division and Group in which he/she would like to participate. The Conference Program, reproduced in this report, sets out the sequence of events within the Groups and Divisions over the one and a half day conference.

The Division directors were asked to keep careful records of the deliberations within the Division, particularly of the recommendations and supporting rationales. They were also asked to collect any materials that were distributed to the Groups for reproduction in these Proceedings. Division Directors Ronald Allen and Lloyd Bitzer of the University of Wisconsin and Frank Dance of the University of Denver were diligent and aggressively original in planning for the work of the Divisions, and they were prompt in forwarding materials for publication. I am deeply indebted to them. The product of their labors and those of the Group chairmen forms the basis for this publication.

Major contributions were made to the Conference by Neil Postman of New York University who delivered a provocative and stimulating keynote address, and by L.S. Harms of the University of Hawaii, who concluded the conference with a look into the future, as the luncheon speaker. Transcripts of their addresses appear in these Proceedings.

The Director of the Conference is grateful to William Work, Executive Secretary of the SCA, for his efficiency in coordinating the efforts of many people who contributed to the Conference. The major kudos, however, go to the participants who generated the thought represented on the pages that follow.

Robert C. Jeffrey
Conference Director

PROGRAM
SCA SUMMER CONFERENCE IX

Palmer House, Chicago — July 12-14, 1973

Thursday Evening, July 12

8:00 pm	Keynote Address: Neil Postman, New York University
9:00 pm	No Host Reception

Friday, July 13

9:00 am	'The Airlie Conference,' First Vice-President Samuel L. Becker
9:15 a.m.	SCA Summer Conference IX Overview, President Robert C. Jeffrey
9:30-9:55 am	Organization of Conference Divisions
Division A:	Education Priorities, Ronald R. Allen, Director
Division B:	Research Priorities, Lloyd F. Bitzer, Director
Division C:	Futuristic Priorities, Frank E.X. Dance, Director
9:55-10:15 am	Coffee Break
10:15 am-12:15 pm	Division Groups Meet
A: Group 1:	Competency-Based Teacher Education, Gustav Friedrich, Chairman
Group 2:	Communication in the Secondary School Language Arts Curricula, Edward Pappas, Chairman
Group 3:	New Thrusts in Departmental Organization and the Preparation of Teachers, Barbara Lieb-Brilhart, Chairman
B: Group 1:	The Future of Communication Research, Gerald R. Miller, Chairman
Group 2:	Research Dealing with Models of Decision-Making, Kenneth E. Andersen, Chairman
Group 3:	Research on Problems of Freedom of Speech, Franklyn S. Haiman, Chairman
C: Group 1:	The Communication Needs & Rights of Mankind, L.S. Harms, Alton Barbour, Chairmen
Group 2:	Future Communication Technologies: Hardware and Software, William Conboy, Larry Wilder, & Jack Barwind, Chairmen
12:15-2:00 pm	Lunch Break
2:00-5:30 pm	Division Group Meetings Continue
8:00-10:30 pm	Optional Division Group Meetings

Saturday, July 14

9:00-10:40 am	Plenary Sessions: Divisions A, B, C.
10:40-11:00 am	Coffee Break
11:00-12:00 noon	Conference Plenary Session: Recommendations and Priorities
12:15-2:00 pm	Conference Luncheon Address: L.S. Harms, University of Hawaii, "The Communication Rights of Mankind: Present and Future"

Presiding at all General Sessions: Robert C. Jeffrey

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface — Robert C. Jeffrey, Conference Director. i

Keynote Address — Neil Postman. 1

Report of Division A: Education Priorities:

- Overview — R. R. Allen, Division Director. 10
- Group One Report: — Gustav W. Friedrich, Group Chairperson. . . . 10
  - Input Phase
  - Recommendations
- Group Two Report: — Edward J. Pappas, Group Chairperson. 12
  - Input Phase
  - Recommendations
- Group Three Report: — Barbara Lieb-Brilhart, Group Chairperson. . . 15
  - Input Phase
  - Recommendations
- Summary
- Appendix A: — Commissioned Stimulus Statements on Competency-Based Teacher Education. 22
- Appendix B: — Commissioned Stimulus Statements on Communication in Secondary School Language Arts Curricula. 50
- Appendix C: — Commissioned Stimulus Statements on Implications of University Reorganization of Speech Departments for the Preparation of Secondary Communication Teachers. 85

Report of Division B: Research Priorities

- Overview — Lloyd F. Bitzer, Division Director. 120
- Group One Report: — Gerald R. Miller, Group Chairperson. 121
  - Recommendations
- Group Two Report: — Kenneth B. Andersen, Group Chairperson. . . 124
  - Recommendations
- Group Three Report: — Franklyn S. Haiman, Group Chairperson. . . . 128

Report of Division C. Futuristic Priorities

- Overview — Frank E.X. Dance, Division Director. 133
- Group One Report — Alton Barbour, Group Chairperson. 133
  - Priorities and Issues
  - Implementations
- Group Two Report: — William Conboy, Larry Wilder, Jack Barwind, Group Co-Chairpersons. . . . 135
  - General Statement
  - Priorities and Issues
  - Implementations
- Appendix: — Prepared Materials and Bibliographies on Future Communication Technologies. 137

Luncheon Address: — "The Communication Rights of Mankind: Present and Future" L.S. Harms. 158